

AMEMB KINSHASA

UNCLASSIFIED

DE RUEHLF #3521/1 2651835
ENR UUUUU ZZH
J R 011315Z SEP 76 ZFF-4
FM AMEMBASSY DAR ES SALAAM
TO RUEHHAK/AMEMBASSY KINSHASA IMMEDIATE 1044
INFO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 2780
BT
UNCLAS ~~SECRET~~ ~~T-2~~ DAR ES SALAAM 3521

SAK

FOR SECRETARY'S PARTY EAGLEBURGER FROM TRATTENBERRY 21 201 44 z76

Z.0. 113521 N/A
CASS: OIP (KISSINGER, HENRY A.)
SUBJ: PRESIDENT NYERERE'S PRESS CONFERENCE SEPT 21

FOLLOWING IS UNOFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF NYERERE PRESS
CONFERENCE IN DAR ES SALAAM SEPTEMBER 21, 1976.

QUOTE

Q. WE'VE BEEN TOLD, FOLLOWING YOUR TALKS WITH DR. KISSINGER,
THAT PRESIDENT NYERERE HAD A GENUINELY POSITIVE REACTION
TO THE BRIEFING HE RECEIVED FROM THE SECRETARY. COULD YOU
COMMENT ON THAT?

A. PERHAPS YOU ALREADY KNOW WHAT WE DISCUSSED. YES, I
NOMINATED GLOOMY WHEN WE MET LAST TIME AND I THINK I TOLD
YOU WHY I SOUNDED GLOOMY. I SAID THAT, BEFORE I HAD MET
DR. KISSINGER, I HAD HAD SOME INDICATIONS WHICH HAD GIVEN
ME SOME HOPE THAT PERHAPS WE ARE MAKING SOME MOVEMENT.
BUT AFTER I HAD MET DR. KISSINGER AND FROM WHAT HE HAD TOLD
ME I FELT PERHAPS MY PREVIOUS OPTIMISM WAS NOT FIRMLY FOUNDED,
AND ACTUALLY I SAID I FELT EVEN LESS OPTIMISTIC AFTER MEETING
DR. KISSINGER THAT I HAD BEFORE. AND I THINK DR. KISSINGER
DID COMMENT LATER THAT NATURALLY HE CAN'T HIMSELF SAY
WHETHER THE SITUATION IS OPTIMISTIC OR PESSIMISTIC UNTIL
HE HAS SEEN WOESTER AND THE OTHERS. NOW, I MUST ADMIT THAT
AFTER SPEAKING TO HIM THIS MORNING, MY MOOD IS BETTER.
I FEEL THAT IT IS POSSIBLE WE ARE MAKING MOVEMENT, THAT
THE BASIS FOR MOVEMENT FORWARD IS THERE DEPENDING UPON SOME
OF THE IMponderABLES, AND I'VE KEPT SAYING MY FRIEND SMITH IS
AN IMponderABLE IN THIS EQUATION. AND A LOT DEPENDS UPON
SMITH.

Q. WHAT HAPPENS NOW? DOES SMITH HAVE TO MAKE A MOVE
AND THEN DO YOU HAVE TO MAKE A MOVE? CAN YOU OUTLINE THE
COMING SEQUENCE?

A. I DON'T KNOW WHAT MOVE I MAKE. WE ARE TRYING TO FACILITATE
THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THOSE CONCERNED -- AND I'M
NOT CONCERNED -- THOSE DIRECTLY CONCERNED CAN BEGIN MAKING
MOVEMENT, AND IN THE CASE OF RHODESIA IT'S BASICALLY THE
RHODESIAN NATIONALISTS, SMITH AND THE BRITISH. WHAT
WE ARE TRYING TO FIND OUT IS WHETHER THE CONDITIONS EXIST
FOR THOSE MAJOR ACTORS TO SIT DOWN TOGETHER AND BEGIN

UNCLASSIFIED

A MOVEMENT. AS I UNDERSTAND IT, I THINK AS WE ALL
UNDEINo Objection To Declassification in Full 2011/05/02 : LOC-HAK-93-2-32-1
WHEN HE WAS THEN FOREIGN SECRETARY LAY DOWN THE CONDITIONS
WHICH WOULD HAVE TO BE ACCEPTED BY MR. SMITH AND HIS
COLLEAGUES BEFORE THE BRITISH COULD SAY CONDITIONS ARE RIGHT
FOR CALLING A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE. I THINK THIS
HAS BEEN MADE CLEAR TO SMITH. WHAT IS BEING EXPECTED
IS THAT WITHIN A FEW DAYS SMITH WILL MAKE A STATEMENT
WHICH INDICATES THAT HE DOES ACTUALLY ACCEPT THIS POSITION.
NOW, SUPPOSING THIS HAPPENS. IF THIS HAPPENS, WHAT ONE
EXPECTS TO HAPPEN IS THAT THE BRITISH WOULD THEN CALL A
CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE AND MOVEMENT BEGINS FROM
THERE. MY FUNCTION IS TO BE ABLE TO SAY WELL, NOW IT
LOOKS AS IF CONDITIONS DO EXIST FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL
CONFERENCE. AND ACTUALLY WE HAVE BEEN WORKING ON THE
BASIS THAT IF SMITH WERE TO ACCEPT THE CONDITIONS LAID DOWN
BY THE BRITISH, THAT WOULD BE A SUFFICIENT BASIS FOR A
CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE TO BE CALLED BY THE BRITISH.

Q. LET ME ASK IT THIS WAY. ON THE BASIS OF WHAT YOU
KNOW TODAY, DO YOU EXPECT THE MAJOR ACTORS IN THIS TO AGREE
SOON TO START SOME KIND OF NEGOTIATIONS?

A. ON THE BASIS OF WHAT I'VE HEARD TODAY, SMITH IS EXPECTED
TO MAKE A STATEMENT. I THINK SOMETIME ON FRIDAY. AND IT
IS BEING EXPECTED THAT IN THIS STATEMENT HE WILL INDICATE
HIS ACCEPTANCE OF WHAT ONE MIGHT PERCEIVE AS THE CALLAGHAN
CONDITIONS FOR A SETTLEMENT. AND I'M SAYING, IF THIS
HAPPENS -- AND I THINK THE AMERICANS AND OURSELVES
HAVE BEEN WORKING ON THE BASIS THAT WE ARE SUPPORTING
THE BRITISH IN THIS POSITION -- IF THIS HAPPENS, THEN
THERE IS NO REASON WHY THE BRITISH SHOULDN'T CALL
A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE. AND THERE IS NO REASON WHY
WE SHOULD NOT ENCOURAGE THOSE OF OUR COLLEAGUES IN
RHODESIA CONCERNED TO PARTICIPATE IN A CONSTITUTIONAL
CONFERENCE.

Q. CAN YOU TELL US WHETHER ANY PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE TOWARDS
UNIFICATION OF THE AFRICAN NATIONALIST GROUPS SO THAT IF
MR. SMITH DOES THAT A NEGOTIATING REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
AFRICANS IN RHODESIA WOULD BE ABLE TO GO TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL
CONFERENCE? WHERE DO YOU STAND NOW ON THAT POINT?

A. I AM SITTING HERE. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER I STAND
ANYWHERE. (LAUGHTER) BUT I CAN'T SAY THE POSITION HAS
CHANGED SINCE WE MET LAST TIME. I'VE BEEN TO WEST AFRICA.
I'VE NOT MET MY FRIENDS IN RHODESIA. I DON'T REALLY THINK
WE HAVE MADE A MOVEMENT BUT YOU MAY REMEMBER, IN
A STATEMENT WE ISSUED BEFORE DR. KISSINGER ARRIVED HERE
LAST TIME, WE SAID THAT IN 1974 AND 1975 WE FAILED MAINLY
BECAUSE OF TWO REASONS. FIRST, SMITH HAD NOT ACCEPTED
MAJORITY RULE, AND WE SAID THIS WAS THE MAJOR REASON: THAT
IF SMITH DOES NOT ACCEPT MAJORITY RULE AND YOU TRY TO
BASE NEGOTIATIONS ON ANY OTHER BASIS THEN YOU GET INTO
TROUBLE. SO SMITH IN 1974 HAD NOT ACCEPTED MAJORITY RULE.
THAT WAS THE MAJOR PROBLEM. THE SECOND ONE, WE DIDN'T
HAVE UNITY. UNITY IS NOT A NECESSARY CONDITION.
WE HAVE SOME UNITY. THE ARMED FORCES ARE FIGHTING
AND NOBODY DENIES THAT THE WAR IS THERE, AND THAT THE WAR
IS HURTING. WELL, IT MUST BE WAGED BY SOMEONE, SOMEONE
MUST BE WAGING THAT WAR. AND SO THE WAR IS THERE, THERE
IS UNITY ON THAT SIDE AND SMITH ADMITS THIS. I THINK AT
HIS CONFERENCE, HIS PARTY CONGRESS, HE NAMED HIS
PROBLEMS -- THE FIRST BEING THE PROBLEM OF SECURITY.

THE UNO No Objection To Declassification in Full 2011/05/02 : LOC-HAK-93-2-32-1

MOVEMENT. AS I UNDERSTAND IT, I THINK AS WE ALL
UNDEF No Objection To Declassification in Full 2011/05/02 : LOC-HAK-93-2-32-1
WHEN HE WAS THEN FOREIGN SECRETARY LAY DOWN THE CONDITIONS
WHICH WOULD HAVE TO BE ACCEPTED BY MR. SMITH AND HIS
COLLEAGUES BEFORE THE BRITISH COULD SAY CONDITIONS ARE RIGHT
FOR CALLING A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE. I THINK THIS
HAS BEEN MADE CLEAR TO SMITH. WHAT IS BEING EXPECTED
IS THAT WITHIN A FEW DAYS SMITH WILL MAKE A STATEMENT
WHICH INDICATES THAT HE DOES ACTUALLY ACCEPT THIS POSITION.
NOW, SUPPOSING THIS HAPPENS. IF THIS HAPPENS, WHAT ONE
EXPECTS TO HAPPEN IS THAT THE BRITISH WOULD THEN CALL A
CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE AND MOVEMENT BEGINS FROM
THERE. MY FUNCTION IS TO BE ABLE TO SAY WELL, NOW IT
LOOKS AS IF CONDITIONS DO EXIST FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL
CONFERENCE. AND ACTUALLY WE HAVE BEEN WORKING ON THE
BASIS THAT IF SMITH WERE TO ACCEPT THE CONDITIONS LAYED DOWN
BY THE BRITISH, THAT WOULD BE A SUFFICIENT BASIS FOR A
CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE TO BE CALLED BY THE BRITISH.

Q. LET ME ASK IT THIS WAY. ON THE BASIS OF WHAT YOU
KNOW TODAY, DO YOU EXPECT THE MAJOR ACTORS IN THIS TO AGREE
SOON TO START SOME KIND OF NEGOTIATIONS?

A. ON THE BASIS OF WHAT I'VE HEARD TODAY, SMITH IS EXPECTED
TO MAKE A STATEMENT. I THINK SOMETIME ON FRIDAY. AND IT
IS BEING EXPECTED THAT IN THIS STATEMENT HE WILL INDICATE
HIS ACCEPTANCE OF WHAT ONE MIGHT PERCEIVE AS THE CALLAGHAN
CONDITIONS FOR A SETTLEMENT. AND I'M SAYING, IF THIS
HAPPENS -- AND I THINK THE AMERICANS AND OURSELVES
HAVE BEEN WORKING ON THE BASIS THAT WE ARE SUPPORTING
THE BRITISH IN THIS POSITION -- IF THIS HAPPENS, THEN
THERE IS NO REASON WHY THE BRITISH SHOULDN'T CALL
A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE. AND THERE IS NO REASON WHY
WE SHOULD NOT ENCOURAGE THOSE OF OUR COLLEAGUES IN
RHODESIA CONCERNED TO PARTICIPATE IN A CONSTITUTIONAL
CONFERENCE.

Q. CAN YOU TELL US WHETHER ANY PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE TOWARDS
UNIFICATION OF THE AFRICAN NATIONALIST GROUPS SO THAT IF
MR. SMITH DOES THAT A NEGOTIATING REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
AFRICANS IN RHODESIA WOULD BE ABLE TO GO TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL
CONFERENCE? WHERE DO YOU STAND NOW ON THAT POINT?

A. I AM SITTING HERE. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER I STAND
ANYWHERE. (LAUGHTER) BUT I CAN'T SAY THE POSITION HAS
CHANGED SINCE WE MET LAST TIME. I'VE BEEN TO WEST AFRICA.
I'VE NOT MET MY FRIENDS IN RHODESIA. I DON'T REALLY THINK
WE HAVE MADE A MOVEMENT BUT YOU MAY REMEMBER, IN
A STATEMENT WE ISSUED BEFORE DR. KISSINGER ARRIVED HERE
LAST TIME, WE SAID THAT IN 1974 AND 1975 WE FAILED MAINLY
BECAUSE OF TWO REASONS. FIRST, SMITH HAD NOT ACCEPTED
MAJORITY RULE, AND WE SAID THIS WAS THE MAJOR REASON: THAT
IF SMITH DOES NOT ACCEPT MAJORITY RULE AND YOU TRY TO
EASE NEGOTIATIONS ON ANY OTHER BASIS THEN YOU GET INTO
TROUBLE. SO SMITH IN 1974 HAD NOT ACCEPTED MAJORITY RULE.
THAT WAS THE MAJOR PROBLEM. THE SECOND ONE, WE DIDN'T
HAVE UNITY. UNITY IS NOT A NECESSARY CONDITION.
WE HAVE SOME UNITY. THE ARMED FORCES ARE FIGHTING
AND NOBODY DENIES THAT THE WAR IS THERE, AND THAT THE WAR
IS HURTING. WELL, IT MUST BE WAGED BY SOMEONE, SOMEONE
MUST BE WAGING THAT WAR. AND SO THE WAR IS THERE, THERE
IS UNITY ON THAT SIDE AND SMITH ADMITS THIS. I THINK AT
HIS CONFERENCE, HIS PARTY CONGRESS, HE NAMED HIS
PROBLEMS -- THE FIRST BEING THE PROBLEM OF SECURITY.

THE OTHER BEING THE ECONOMY. THEY ARE CONNECTED, I THINK, WITH THE ARMED STRUGGLE. SO THERE IS AN ARMED STRUGGLE AND THERE IS UNITY ON THAT SIDE. WE TRIED TO HELP THE FORMER ZAPU AND FORMER ZANU TO FORM A SINGLE ORGANIZATION AND UP FAR WE HAVE FAILED. BUT ZAPU AND ZANU, THE FORMER LEADERS, ARE STILL THERE. IF CONDITIONS APPEAR RIGHT FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE, IT IS NOT NECESSARY THAT THEY COME TO THIS CONFERENCE AS A SINGLE PARTY. WHAT THEY NEED TO DO IS TO GO TO THIS CONFERENCE AND WORK TOGETHER AND I THINK THIS CAN BE ARRANGED.

Q. FOR CLARIFICATION PURPOSES, SO THAT WE CAN BE AS PRECISE AS YOU CAN HELP US TO BE, IS IT NOW YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT MR. SMITH HAS ACCEPTED THE PREMISE OF MAJORITY RULE WITHIN A PERIOD OF 18-24 MONTHS? IF THAT IS THE CASE, DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THERE IS ANY FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN YOUR PERCEPTION OF WHAT THAT LANGUAGE MEANS, DR. KISSINGER'S PERCEPTION, AND MR. SMITH'S PERCEPTION?

A. FOR ALL I KNOW THERE MAY BE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PERCEPTION OF WHAT THAT LANGUAGE MEANS BETWEEN SMITH AND OURSELVES. I NOW BELIEVE THAT DR. KISSINGER AND MYSELF AND THE BRITISH SPEAK PRACTICALLY THE SAME LANGUAGE AND UNDERSTAND THE SAME THING. THIS IS MY PRESENT UNDERSTANDING OF THE SITUATION. WHETHER SMITH ALSO UNDERSTANDS THE SAME THING, I DON'T KNOW, BUT WE HAVE TO WAIT. THAT IS, I AM SAYING, IN THIS EQUATION SMITH IS IMPONDERABLE. WE HAVE TO WAIT. HE IS GOING TO MAKE A STATEMENT, I THINK SOMETIME ON FRIDAY.

Q. ONE REASON I ASK ABOUT THAT, MR. KISSINGER HAD SAID THAT ONE OF THE THINGS WE DID NEED TO GET FROM THE AFRICAN LEADERS IS SOME CLARIFICATION. HE DID NOT KNOW WHAT CLARIFICATIONS THEY WERE OR HOW SUBSTANTIAL THAT PROBLEM IS CONCERNING CLARIFICATION.

ANSWER: THE CONDITIONS ISSUED BY MR. CALLAGHAN WERE VERY CLEAR-CUT. IF SMITH SAYS HE ACCEPTS IT, HE IS ACCEPTING SOMETHING THAT WAS VERY CLEARLY STATED. AND LET'S BE QUITE FRANK, AS SOON AS CALLAGHAN MADE THOSE STATEMENTS, SOME OF SMITH'S SUPPORTERS THOUGHT INDEPENDENCE IN TWO YEARS WAS TOO SHORT A PERIOD. IT'S ABSURD. I THINK ONE OF THEM, CALLED, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE RHODESIAN FRONT, CALLED IT ABSURD, OR A STRONGER WORD. JOSHUA NKOMO THOUGHT IT WAS TOO LONG. SO, ALL I AM SAYING IS THAT IF SMITH SAYS CONDITIONS ARE ACCEPTABLE, THAT IS A BASIS FOR NEGOTIATION; IT IS NOT A BASIS FOR SETTLEMENT; IT IS A BASIS FOR NEGOTIATION.

QUESTION: ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT SMITH DOES ACCEPT THE GENERAL FRAMEWORK OF THE CALLAGHAN PROPOSAL, IN HIS STATEMENT ON FRIDAY, WHAT ROLE DO YOU SEE HIM PLAYING IN THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS THAT FOLLOWS? DOES HE HAVE TO STEP ASIDE IN YOUR VIEW OR, SO LONG AS HE ACCEPTS IT, DO YOU THINK THAT HE SHOULD BE DEALT WITH?

ANSWER: I DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENS. I DON'T KNOW WHAT ROLE HE IS GOING TO PLAY AT THAT CONFERENCE. SOMEONE WILL HAVE TO, I ASSUME, REPRESENT A GOVERNMENT OF RHODESIA. IT'S AN ILLEGAL GOVERNMENT, BUT I SUPPOSE AT THAT POINT YOU DON'T ASK TOO MANY QUESTIONS. YOU SIT DOWN AND YOU DISCUSS.

ANSWER: I WOULD THINK SO.

QUESTION: AT THE OTHER NEWS CONFERENCE WE HAD, YOU WERE ALSO GLOOMY ABOUT THE SITUATION REGARDING NAMIBIA. YOU SAID YOU WERE LESS HOPEFUL THAN YOU HAD BEEN. DR. KISSINGER HAD SAID THAT CONSIDERABLE PROGRESS WAS MADE ALSO ON THE NAMIBIAN QUESTION. DO YOU EXPECT THERE CAN BE A CONFERENCE CALLED SOON ON THAT SUBJECT, AS WELL?

ANSWER: I DON'T EXPECT THAT CONFERENCE ON NAMIBIA TO COME SOON. LET ME EXPLAIN. I HAD ALL THE TIME BELIEVED AND STATED THAT I THOUGHT THE CONDITIONS FOR A SETTLEMENT WERE BETTER IN NAMIBIA THAN IN RHODESIA. WHY? TO GO BACK TO THE ANSWER I MADE TO A PREVIOUS QUESTION -- THE EXPLANATION I MADE. IN THE CASE OF RHODESIA, I SAID WE HAD FAILED THERE BECAUSE TWO CONDITIONS DID NOT EXIST: ONE, THE MINORITY GOVERNMENT DID NOT ACCEPT MAJORITY RULE. THIS WAS THE MAJOR ONE. SECOND, WE DID NOT HAVE UNITY AMONG THE NATIONALIST LEADERS. IN THE CASE OF NAMIBIA, ONCE YOU HAD GOT THE SOUTH AFRICANS TO SAY WE ACCEPT INDEPENDENCE FOR NAMIBIA, THE ARGUMENT THEN IS DO YOU REGARD A SERIES OF BANTUSTANS THERE AS INDEPENDENCE OR WHAT. THAT WAS, THEY HAD SAID, ACCEPT INDEPENDENCE IN NAMIBIA AND YOU HAVE A NATIONALIST ORGANIZATION THERE WHICH IS RECOGNIZED BY BOTH THE UNITED NATIONS AND OAU. THEN YOU SAID WHAT YOU NEEDED TO DO WAS TO GET THESE CHIEF ACTORS TO A CONFERENCE TABLE. THE ACTORS BEING SOUTH AFRICA ON ONE HAND AND THE REPRESENTATIVES OF NAMIBIA, WHOM WE ALL RECOGNIZE, SWAPO, UNDER UNITED NATIONS AUSPICES. THE SOUTH AFRICANS' POSITION HAS ALWAYS BEEN THAT SWAPO IS ANATHEMA. THEY HAVE BEEN MOVED INTO A POSITION WHERE NOW THEY CAN SAY, YES, SWAPO DOES EXIST, BUT SWAPO IS ONE OF 20. AND I SAY AS LONG AS THE SOUTH AFRICANS REMAIN THERE, IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO HAVE A CONFERENCE. CERTAINLY I WOULDN'T ASK SWAPO TO COME TO A CONFERENCE WHERE THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO BE ONE OF 20. I CAN'T KNOW WHO WOULD CALL THAT KIND OF CONFERENCE. SOUTH AFRICA HAD CALLED SOME CONFERENCE IN WINDHOEK. THIS CONFERENCE TURNED OUT -- I BELIEVE IT WAS SOME KIND OF STUPID CONFERENCE. IT TURNED OUT TO BE MORE STUPID THAN EVEN I THOUGHT. I THOUGHT THIS WAS A CONFERENCE OF THE CHIEFS AND SETTLERS THERE AND FOR SOUTH AFRICA BECAUSE A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE, I REPEAT, IS A CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THAT COLONIAL POWER AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COLONY. SO I THOUGHT THAT THE SO-CALLED CONFERENCE IN WINDHOEK WAS A CONFERENCE BETWEEN SOUTH AFRICA ON ONE HAND AND CHIEF KAPUUBO AND THE SETTLERS AND WE THOUGHT IF THAT IS SO, IT IS NONSENSE BECAUSE SWAPO DOES NOT EXIST. AND, AS IT TURNED OUT TO BE, IT WAS EVEN WORSE. THE SOUTH AFRICANS WERE NOT THERE. IT WAS A CONFERENCE BETWEEN CHIEF KAPUUBO AND THE SETTLERS. IT WAS NO CONFERENCE AT ALL. SO WHAT THE SOUTH AFRICANS ARE TALKING ABOUT -- THE SOUTH AFRICANS ARE CALLING A CONFERENCE -- IS THAT A NEW CONFERENCE SHOULD BE CONVENED OUTSIDE NAMIBIA, AND SWAPO -- THIS CONFERENCE OF CHIEFS SHOULD MOVE ITS VENUE AND IT SHOULD INVITE SWAPO TO ATTEND IT. NOW, FANCY THAT THIS CHIEF KAPUUBO WOULD SEND AN INVITATION TO SWAPO AND SAY COME AND ATTEND A CONFERENCE AND WE CALL A CONFERENCE. NOW, IT IS ABSURD. AS LONG AS YOU HAVE THIS KIND OF SITUATION YOU HAVE NO CONFERENCE, AND

TO ATTEND EITHER. BUT IF SOME MOVEMENT HAS BEEN MADE IN THE No Objection To Declassification in Full 2011/05/02 : LOC-HAK-93-2-32-1, SOUTH AFRICA NOW SAYS, YES, AT ONE TIME THEY DIDN'T THINK THE UNITED NATIONS SHOULD HAVE

ANYTHING TO DO WITH THIS CONFERENCE AT ALL. I THINK THAT NOW THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS -- I CAN'T MAKE UP SOME ROLE BY THE UNITED NATIONS -- I CAN'T SAY SOME ROLE DEFINED BY SOUTH AFRICA (SIC). AND SO WE ARE STILL DZXPPLY DEFINING A CONFERENCE. WHAT IS A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE IF IT IS NOT BETWEEN THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE COLONIAL POWER -- IN THIS CASE I AM WILLING TO LOOK RIDICULOUS AND SAY SOUTH AFRICA -- AND SWAPO, -- ALTHOUGH WE DON'T RECOGNIZE SOUTH AFRICA AT ALL AS THE LEGAL COLONIAL POWER FOR THAT COUNTRY. BUT I AM WILLING TO LOOK THAT RIDICULOUS. LET THE CONFERENCE GO THROUGH. IF THE SOUTH AFRICANS SAY NO, WE DON'T WANT TO ATTEND, WE SAY FINE. IN THAT CASE, VEENINGS TO DE JURE AUTHORITY AND LET THEM HAVE A CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND SWAPO. SOUTH AFRICA CAN'T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS AND WE HAVEN'T RESOLVED THIS ONE. SOME MOVEMENT HAS BEEN MADE, WHICH I HAVE EXPLAINED.

QUESTION: IN ANSWER TO A PREVIOUS QUESTION, YOU SAID THAT, IF MR. SMITH ACCEPTS THE CALLAGHAN PLAN IT WILL BE SUFFICIENT FOR NEGOTIATION BUT NOT FOR A SETTLEMENT. WOULD THE CONDITIONS BE CHANGED IN THE EVENTUAL SETTLEMENT FROM THE CALLAGHAN PLAN?

ANSWER: NO, NO. WHAT IS A SETTLEMENT? YOU HAVE GOT TO WORK OUT A SETTLEMENT; YOU WORK OUT A CONSTITUTION; YOU WORK OUT A CLEAR CONSTITUTION. YOU WORK OUT A DATE FOR INDEPENDENCE. THE CALLAGHAN THING IS SAYING INDEPENDENCE IN TWO YEARS, 18 MONTHS OR LESS. A SETTLEMENT CAN'T SAY TWO YEARS, 18 MONTHS OR LESS. A SETTLEMENT IS DEFINITE AND IS CLEAR, AND YOU HAVE GOT TO PUT THIS STRAIGHT-FORWARD CLEARLY, DEFINITELY. THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT SAFEGUARDS FOR THE MINORITIES AND SO FORTH. I BELIEVE THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE DATE OF INDEPENDENCE AND THE DATE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT. ALL THESE THINGS HAVE TO COME OUT OF A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE.

QUESTION: IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT INDEPENDENCE WILL BE SECURED WITHIN TWO YEARS OF LAST MARCH, THAT IS, BY MARCH 1978?

ANSWER: I AM SAYING IF SMITH ACCEPTS THE CALLAGHAN CONDITIONS -- WHICH SAY, AT THE OUTSIDE, INDEPENDENCE IN TWO YEARS -- THEN THE CHANCES ARE THIS INDEPENDENCE IS LIKELY TO BE LESS THAN TWO YEARS. BUT I AM TELLING YOU JOSHUA NKOMO ANNOUNCED THE OTHER DAY, JOSHUA (NKOMO) IS ONE OF THE BIG MODERATES OF RHODESIA. I THINK HE IS GIVING IT A YEAR NOW.

QUESTION: DO YOU REALLY THINK THAT THE ELEVEN YEARS THAT WE HAVE HAD WITH RHODESIA, THAT MR. SMITH IS NOW GOING TO CHANGE?

ANSWER: CHANGE? CHANGE? I DON'T BELIEVE THAT HE WILL CHANGE. IF YOU AND I UNDERSTAND SQS WBX323 .3-, 76 :#-, &3. BUT IF THE UNITED STATES

RE

O SAY TO SMITH THAT THE GAME IS UP, WELL, SMITH IS NOT SO FOOLISH NOT TO UNDERSTAND THAT HE CAN'T GO ON. SO I AM WAITING FOR FRIDAY.

QUESTION: MAY I JUST FOLLOW UP? IF THIS HAPPENS -- THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE IS TO BE ORGANIZED -- WHAT HAPPENS



TELEGRAM

UNCLASSIFIED

ANYTHING TO DO WITH THIS CONFERENCE AT ALL. I THINK THAT NOW SOME
ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS -- I CAN'T MAKE UP SOME ROLE BY THE
UNITED NATIONS -- I CAN'T SAY SOME ROLE DEFINED BY SOUTH
AFRICA (SIC). AND SO WE ARE STILL SIMPLY DEFINING A CONFERENCE.

WHAT IS A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE IF IT IS NOT BETWEEN THE
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE COLONIAL POWER -- IN THIS CASE I AM WILLING
TO LOOK RIDICULOUS AND SAY SOUTH AFRICA -- AND SWAPO, --
ALTHOUGH WE DON'T RECOGNIZE SOUTH AFRICA AT ALL AS THE LEGAL
COLONIAL POWER FOR THAT COUNTRY. BUT I AM WILLING TO LOOK
THAT RIDICULOUS. LET THE CONFERENCE GO THROUGH. IF THE SOUTH
AFRICANS SAY NO, WE DON'T WANT TO ATTEND, WE SAY FINE. IN
THAT CASE, WE TURN TO DE JURE AUTHORITY AND LET THEM HAVE
A CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND SWAPO. SOUTH AFRICA
CAN'T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS AND WE HAVEN'T RESOLVED THIS ONE.
SOME MOVEMENT HAS BEEN MADE, WHICH I HAVE EXPLAINED.

QUESTION: IN ANSWER TO A PREVIOUS QUESTION, YOU SAID THAT,
IF MR. SMITH ACCEPTS THE CALLAGHAN PLAN IT WILL BE SUFFICIENT
FOR NEGOTIATION BUT NOT FOR A SETTLEMENT. WOULD
THE CONDITIONS BE CHANGED IN THE EVENTUAL SETTLEMENT FROM THE
CALLAGHAN PLAN?

ANSWER: NO, NO. WHAT IS A SETTLEMENT? YOU HAVE GOT TO WORK OUT
A SETTLEMENT; YOU WORK OUT A CONSTITUTION; YOU WORK OUT A CLEAR
CONSTITUTION. YOU WORK OUT A DATE FOR INDEPENDENCE. THE
CALLAGHAN THING IS SAYING INDEPENDENCE IN TWO YEARS, 18
MONTHS OR LESS. A SETTLEMENT CAN'T SAY TWO YEARS, 18 MONTHS OR
LESS. A SETTLEMENT IS DEFINITE AND IS CLEAR, AND YOU HAVE GOT
TO PUT THIS STRAIGHT-FORWARD CLEARLY, DEFINITELY.
THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT SAFEGUARDS FOR THE MINORITIES AND SO
FORTH. I BELIEVE THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE DATE OF
INDEPENDENCE AND THE DATE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROVISIONAL
GOVERNMENT. ALL THESE THINGS HAVE TO COME OUT OF A CONSTITUTIONAL
CONFERENCE.

QUESTION: IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT INDEPENDENCE WILL BE
SECURED WITHIN TWO YEARS OF LAST MARCH, THAT IS, BY MARCH
1978?

ANSWER: I AM SAYING IF SMITH ACCEPTS THE CALLAGHAN CONDITIONS --
WHICH SAY, AT THE OUTSIDE, INDEPENDENCE IN TWO YEARS -- THEN
THE CHANCES ARE THIS INDEPENDENCE IS LIKELY TO BE LESS THAN
TWO YEARS. BUT I AM TELLING YOU JOSHUA NKOMO ANNOUNCED THE
OTHER DAY, JOSHUA (NKOMO) IS ONE OF THE BIG MODERATES OF RHODESIA,
I THINK HE IS GIVING IT A YEAR NOW.

QUESTION: DO YOU REALLY THINK THAT THE ELEVEN YEARS THAT WE HAVE
HAD WITH RHODESIA, THAT MR. SMITH IS NOW GOING TO CHANGE?

ANSWER: CHANGE? CHANGE? I DON'T BELIEVE THAT HE WILL CHANGE. IF
YOU AND I UNDERSTAND WHAT WE MEAN BY CHANGE. BUT IF THE UNITED
STATES WERE TO SAY TO SMITH THAT THE GAME IS UP, WELL, SMITH
IS NOT SO FOOLISH NOT TO UNDERSTAND THAT HE CAN'T GO ON. SO
I AM WAITING FOR FRIDAY.



AMEMB KINSHASA

TELEGRAM

UNCLASSIFIED

Classification

QUESTION: MAY I JUST FOLLOW UP? IF THIS HAPPENS -- THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE IS TO BE ORGANIZED -- WHAT HAPPENS IN THE MEAN TIME? WHAT ARE YOUR VIEWS ON AN INTERIM GOVERNMENT? SHOULD THAT BE INSTANTLY THEN A BLACK MAJORITY INTERIM GOVERNMENT LED BY A BLACK PRIME MINISTER ON AN INTERIM BASIS WHILE THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE TAKES PLACE, OR DO YOU ENVISAGE THE GOVERNMENT (INTERRUPTED BY ANSWER)...?

ANSWER: I AM NOT GOING INTO DETAILS BUT I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT THAT ONCE CALLAGHAN SAYS "I AM SATISFIED" AND WE SAY TO CALLAGHAN "WE ARE EQUALLY SATISFIED", THEN I WOULD ENVISAGE THAT A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE IS CALLED AND THAT AMCWG THE THINGS TO BE AGREED AT THIS CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE WOULD BE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT, OF A GOVERNMENT OF TRANSITION. I CALL IT THE CHISSANO GOVERNMENT. AND THE CHISSANO GOVERNMENT, TO BE ACCEPTABLE, HAS TO BE A MAJORITY -- AN AFRICAN MAJORITY -- GOVERNMENT. IT IS NOT THE INDEPENDENCE GOVERNMENT. INDEPENDENCE IS STILL TO COME LATER, BUT ONE EXPECTS THE IMMEDIATE RESULTS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL TALKS WOULD BE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THIS GOVERNMENT WHICH LEADS THE GOVERNMENT TO INDEPENDENCE. THE COUNTRIES MAKE THE NECESSARY PREPARATIONS FOR INDEPENDENCE. AND THOSE PREPARATIONS -- THE PROVISIONS OF THOSE PREPARATIONS -- WILL HAVE BEEN AGREED AT THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE.

QUESTION: IN WHAT PROCESS, AT WHAT TIME, WOULD THE GUERRILLA WAR END?

ANSWER: AT THE FORMATION OF THIS PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT. ONCE YOU HAVE FORMED THIS PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT, IT IS A GOVERNMENT LED BY AN AFRICAN MAJORITY GOVERNMENT, AND IT IS THIS GOVERNMENT WHICH CALLS OFF THE WAR. WHO ELSE CALLS OFF THIS WAR? IT IS AT THAT STAGE TO CALL OFF THE WAR.

QUESTION: HAVE THE FRONT LINE PRESIDENTS ASKED DR. KISSINGER TO SEEK THE RELEASE OF POLITICAL PRISONERS IN RHODESIA, AND IF THAT REQUEST HAS BEEN MADE, DO YOU KNOW IF HE HAS MADE ANY PROGRESS ON IT?

ANSWER: WE HAVE NOT MADE THIS, BUT CLEARLY, IF SMITH WAS TO ANNOUNCE THAT HE ACCEPTS THE CONSTITUTIONAL TALKS, I HAVE THE FEELING THAT BEFORE THOSE CONSTITUTIONAL TALKS BEGIN, THE RHODESIAN LEADERS WOULD SAY "WHERE ARE OUR COLLEAGUES? THEY ARE LYING DOWN IN JAIL." BUT CERTAINLY WE HAVE NOT RAISED THIS WITH DR. KISSINGER. IT WAS NOT THE KIND OF THING TO RAISE WITH DR. KISSINGER.

QUESTION: WHAT WOULD BE THE KIND OF SPECIFIC LANGUAGE THAT YOU WOULD HAVE TO HEAR FROM SMITH FOR YOU TO BE SATISFIED ON FRIDAY? THERE IS GOING TO BE A GREAT QUESTION OF AMBIGUITIES AND WHAT-NOT. WHAT MUST YOU HEAR?



AMEMB KINSHASA

No Objection To Declassification in Full 2011/05/02 : LOC-HAK-93-2-32-1

TELEGRAM

UNCLASSIFIED

ANSWER: I CAN'T WRITE SMITH'S SPEECH FOR HIM, BUT TO ALL INTELLIGENT PEOPLE SMITH MAY FIND SOME WAY OF SAYING "I DO ACCEPT THE CALLAGHAN CONDITIONS". AND IF IT IS SAID, HOWEVER ROUND ABOUT IT IS SAID -- WE ARE VERY INTELLIGENT PEOPLE; HE IS EVEN MORE INTELLIGENT, I THINK. WE SHALL UNDERSTAND THAT HE HAS SAID IT. HE SAID IT. IT WOULD BE VERY SILLY FOR SMITH TO TRY AT THIS LATE HOUR TO FOOOL ANYBODY. HE HAS GOT TO MAKE IT QUITE CLEAR THAT HE DOES ACCEPT THESE CDHNITIONS.

QUESTION: WHAT WOULD BE YOUR DEGREE OF FAITH IN NEGOTIATIONS THAT THE WHITE RHODESIANS WOULD ENGAIPE IN?

ANSWER: I HAVE NO FAITH IN NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN SMITH AND THE NATIONALISTS IN RHODESIA. I HAVE NO FAITH WHATESOEVER. IF THOSE NATIONALISTS WERE MY FRIENDS, I WOULD PROBABLY WARN THEM NOT TO TAKE PART AGAIN IN THAT KIND OF NEGOTIATIONS.

QUESTION: DOES THIS CONFERENCE HAVE TO BE IN LONDON OR CAN IT BE ... (INTERRUPTED BY ANSWER) ...?

ANSWER: NOT NECESSARILY IN LONDON.

QUESTION: WHO CHAIRS IT?

ANSWER: DON'T ASK ME TO ORGANIZE EVERY BLESSED DETAIL OF THIS THING.

QUESTION: BUT I DO WANT TO FOLLOW IT UP, THOUGH.

ANSWER: YES, DO FOLLOW IT UP, PLEASE. WHO CHAIRS IT IS IMPORAANT. I AM SAYING WE ARE SUPPORTING THE CALLAGHAN CONDITIONS FOR CALLING A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE. I BELIEVE, THEREFORE, IT IS THE BRITISH WHO WOULD BE CALLING THAT CONFERENCE, IT IS THE BRITISH WHO WOULD PROVIDE THE CHAIRMAN. WHETHER THEY ARE GOING TO BE HONORED BY CALLAGHAN HIMSELF BEING CHAIRMAN, I DON' KNOW. BUT I DO EXPECT THAT, REALLY, WE ARE DRAWING TO THE END. TO DRAW TO THE END IS TO GET TO THE BRITISH TO CALL THIS CONFERENCE AND TO GET TO THE NECESSARY LEGISLATION AND ALL THAT. AND YOU CAN'T BEGIN HEDGING AGAIN. SMITH CANNOT BEGIN HEDGING ABOUT THIS AGAIN. BECAUSE HEDGING WOULD REALLY RAISE ALL THE SUSPICIONS THAT HE DOESN'T MEAN BUSINESS.

Q. CAN YOU TELL US IF YOU HAVE BEEN IN CONTACT WITH THE OTHER FRONT LINE PRESIDENTS? IF THEIR VIEWS CORRESPOND WITH YOURS, AND ALSO IF YOU EXPECT A NEW SUMMIT CONFERENCE TO BE HELD SHORTLY AMONG THE FIVE OF YOU?

A. WELL, I THINK I HAVE BEEN REPRESENTED. IN THE FIRST PLACE, I HAVE NOT BEEIN IN CONTACT WITH ALL MY COLLEAGUES, CERTAINLY, BUT AS YOU KNOW, DR. KISSINGER HAS BEEN SEEING PRESIDENT KAUNDA. SO PRESIDENT KAUNDA KNOWS WHAT IS GOING ON AND I KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON. WE MAY OR MAY NOT CALL A SUMMIT OF THE NECESSARY AT ALL

No Objection To Declassification in Full 2011/05/02 : LOC-HAK-93-2-32-1



TELEGRAM

AMEMB KINSHASA

UNCLASSIFIED

Classification

Q. AS YOU SUGGESTED THE POSSIBLE FUTURE, I SEE A POSSIBLE ANOMALOUS SITUATION OCCURRING IN WHICH THE FIGHTING MIGHT BE ENDING IN RHODESIA BUT CONTINUING IN NAMIBIA. IS THAT A POSSIBILITY AND CAN YOU HAVE PEACE ON THE FRONT WITHOUT HAVING IT ON THE OTHER? 9

A. MAJORITY RULE IN RHODESIA CAN'T STOP THE FIGHTING IN NAMIBIA. THESE ARE SEPARATE CASES. IF WE WANT TO STOP SIMULTANEOUSLY LET'S MOVE SIMULTANEOUSLY. LET'S ESTABLISH THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH YOU CAN HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE ON NAMIBIA GOING ON AT THE SAME TIME AS A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE ON RHODESIA AND THEY FORM A PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT AT THE SAME TIME, AND NECESSARILY THIS PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT WILL CALL OFF THE ARMED STRUGGLE. AT THE SAME TIME IT WOULD SUIT ME. I HOPE IT SUITS SMITH AND VORSTER ALSO. IT WOULD CERTAINLY SUIT ME.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPAIN